



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/568,093	11/13/2006	Pierre Lescuyer	108140.00041	7810
38485	7590	06/25/2009		
ARENT FOX LLP 1675 BROADWAY NEW YORK, NY 10019			EXAMINER COOK, LISA V	
			ART UNIT 1641	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/25/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

NYIPDocket@arentfox.com
Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/568,093

Applicant(s)

LESCUYER ET AL.

Examiner

LISA V. COOK

Art Unit

1641

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 23-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 23-34 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/S508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/10/06 2/7/07
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I (claims 1-12) in the reply filed on 25 March 2009 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
2. The Restriction Requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

3. Claims 23-34 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 3/25/09.

Priority

4. It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in prior Application No. PCT/GB04/03512 filed 8/16/09 and United Kingdom Application No.0319167.3 filed 8/15/03. *A reference to the prior application must be inserted as the first sentence(s) of the specification of this application or in an application data sheet (37 CFR 1.76), if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121, or 365(c). See 37 CFR 1.78(a). For benefit claims under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c), the reference must include the relationship (i.e., continuation, divisional, or continuation-in-part) of all nonprovisional applications.*

If the application is a utility or plant application filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after November 29, 2000, the specific reference to the prior application must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the actual filing date of the application or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. If the application is a utility or plant application which entered the national stage from an international application filed on or after November 29, 2000, after compliance with 35 U.S.C. 371, the specific reference must be submitted during the pendency of the application and within the later of four months from the date on which the national stage commenced under 35 U.S.C. 371(b) or (f) or sixteen months from the filing date of the prior application. See 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2)(ii) and (a)(5)(ii). This time period is not extendable and a failure to submit the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 119(e) and/or 120, where applicable, within this time period is considered a waiver of any benefit of such prior application(s) under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). A benefit claim filed after the required time period may be accepted if it is accompanied by a grantable petition to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), 120, 121 and 365(c). The petition must be accompanied by (1) the reference required by 35 U.S.C. 120 or 119(e) and 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) to the prior application (unless previously submitted), (2) a surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t), and (3) a statement that the entire delay between the date the claim was due under 37 CFR 1.78(a)(2) or (a)(5) and the date the claim was filed was unintentional.

The Director may require additional information where there is a question whether the delay was unintentional. The petition should be addressed to: Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

If the reference to the prior application was previously submitted within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 1.78(a), but not in the first sentence(s) of the specification or an application data sheet (ADS) as required by 37 CFR 1.78(a) (e.g., if the reference was submitted in an oath or declaration or the application transmittal letter), and the information concerning the benefit claim was recognized by the Office as shown by its inclusion on the first filing receipt, the petition under 37 CFR 1.78(a) and the surcharge under 37 CFR 1.17(t) are not required. Applicant is still required to submit the reference in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78(a) by filing an amendment to the first sentence(s) of the specification or an ADS. See MPEP § 201.11.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the examiner on form PTO-892 or applicant on PTO-1449 has cited the references they have not been considered.

Art Unit: 1641

6. The information disclosure statement filed 2/10/06 has been considered as to the merits before First Action.

7. The information disclosure statement filed 2/7/07 has been considered as to the merits before First Action.

Specification

8. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

9. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See pages 14 and 22, for example.

Sequence Non-Compliance

10. This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). However, this application fails to comply with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.821 through 1.825 for the reason(s) set forth on the attached Notice To Comply With Requirements For Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequence And/Or Amino Acid Sequence Disclosures. Applicant must comply with the requirements of the sequence rules (37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825) before the application can be examined under 35 U.S.C. §§ 131 and 132.

Art Unit: 1641

The specification (for example see pages 3 and 4) recites sequences but the actual sequence identification numbers are not included. Please provide the appropriate sequence identification numbers in order to comply with the sequence rules.

Applicant is given **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this communication within which to comply with the sequence rules, 37 CFR 1.821 - 1.825. Failure to comply with these requirements will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application under 37 CFR 1.821(g). Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Direct the reply to the undersigned. Applicant is requested to return a copy of the attached Notice to Comply with the reply.

Claim Objections

11. Claims 1-12 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 1 utilize acronyms (for example see Apo). Although the terms may have art-recognized meanings, it is not clear if applicant intends to claim any prior art definition of the abbreviations. The terms should be defined in their first instance. The initial explanation will convey intended meaning of subsequent abbreviations in the claims. Please define in the claims in order to obviate this objection.

12. Claim 5 is objected to because of the following informalities: "ischaemic" and "haemorrhagic" are misspelled. The terms should be "ischemic" and hemorrhagic". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

I. Claims 1-4 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.102(b) as being anticipated by Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264).

Kasturi et al. discloses that the presence of known RFLPs in the apolipoprotein A-I-C-III gene cluster were restricted with SmaI and PstI and assessed for stroke risk in an American population. See abstract.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negative by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

II. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) in view of Jackowski et al. (WO 00/52476).

Please see Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) as set forth above.

Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching the evaluation of multiple polypeptides and distinguishing between ischemic and hemorrhagic stroke.

However, Jackowski discloses method for assessing stroke (cerebral injury) via the measurement of multiple markers. The various markers include calbindin-D, myeline basic protein, S-100 β , and thrombomodulin. See figure 2 for example. On page 1, Jackowski discloses that stroke is routinely diagnosed with CT scans to assess brain damage. See lines 18-29. The multiple markers may be determined in the same sample or from samples obtained at different time periods. See page 12 lines 3-16.

Art Unit: 1641

This allows for patient analysis and monitoring. The detection of multiple markers can distinguish and/or differentiate between ischemic and hemorrhagic events. This evaluation aids in patient treatment. Jackowski teaches the determination of a plurality of patient derived markers which are correlated to a subarachnoid hemorrhage. See abstract, figure 2, and column 3-4, for example. See page 2 lines 11-22 and figure 2/6, for example.

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to evaluate multiple polypeptides as taught by Jackowski et al. in the method of Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) because Jackowski et al. taught that the detection of multiple markers can distinguish and/or differentiate between ischemic and hemorrhagic events. This evaluation aids in patient treatment. See abstract, figure 2, and column 3-4, for example. See page 2 lines 11-22 and figure 2/6, for example.

III. Claims 6 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) in view of Yates et al. (U.S. Patent #5,538,897).

Please see Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) as set forth above.

Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) differ from the instant invention in not specifically teaching mass spectrometric analysis of the peptide or peptide fragment measurements.

However, Yates et al. disclose a method of correlating a peptide fragment with amino acid sequences derived from a database. A peptide is analyzed by a tandem mass spectrometer to yield a peptide fragment mass spectrum (mass fingerprinting). A protein sequence database or a nucleotide sequence database is used to predict/identify the fragment. For each candidate sequence, a plurality (pool) of fragments of the sequences is identified and the masses-m/z ratios of the fragments are predicted and used to form a predicted mass spectrum. See abstract.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize tandem mass spectrometry database sequence comparison as taught by Yates et al. to identify the fragments found in the method of Kasturi et al. (Stroke, Vol.23, No.9, 1992, pages 1257-1264) because Yates et al. taught that the patented system for correlating fragment spectra with known sequences would avoid delay and/or subjectivity in hypothesizing or deducing candidate amino acid sequences from the fragment spectra. (Column 1 lines 44-62).

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this because in order to achieve maximal data processing/protein manipulation to determine the parameter of interest.

15. For reasons aforementioned, no claims are allowed.

16. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The Group 1641 – Central Fax number is (571) 273-8300, which is able to receive transmissions 24 hours/day, 7 days/week.

Art Unit: 1641

In the event Applicant would like to fax an unofficial communication, the Examiner should be contacted for the appropriate Right Fax number.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lisa V. Cook whose telephone number is (571) 272-0816. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 AM - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Shibuya, can be reached on (571) 272-0806.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lisa V. Cook
Remsen
(571) 272-0816
6/22/09

/Lisa V. Cook/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1641

